

RFP #0634-244
e-Child Care Feasibility Study Project
Amendment #1
Questions & Answers

- 1 The RPP requests a “reworked” Feasibility Study. Is that rework necessary because of deficiencies in the original study?
- (a) Is there a specific list of deficiencies from the original Feasibility Study that can be provided as guidelines for estimating the rework effort?
 - (b) What percentage, and specifically which sections, of the original Feasibility Study can be reused, or retained as is?
 - (c) Which components of the previous study are you most concerned with?
 - (d) What is the basis for concern for those areas found deficient?
 - (e) What type of assessment and/or validation work would give you the greatest confidence relative to each concern?

DSHS Answer:

The original 2005 Feasibility Study did not have any deficiencies. The 2005 study dealt with the scope defined at that time.

- 2 It seems likely that considerable source documentation was generated to support the original Feasibility Study.
- (a) If so, what documentation remains available that would have value for this current effort and where do the gaps exist in that data?
 - (b) What gaps have been identified in source documentation gathered for the previous Feasibility Study that requires further development?
 - (c) Can you provide access to that information to help with our efforts to estimate the tasks related to this project? If so, when?

DSHS Answer:

The new feasibility study will be based on the needs and requirements of the recently created Department of Early Learning. There are currently no source documents to support the new feasibility study. Documents supporting the 2005 Feasibility Study will be made available to the Project Manager and Team successful bidder.

- 3 A new Costs Benefit Analysis is required by March 2007. Does data exist currently to support development of the Cost Benefit Analysis? If so, how much and of what type?

DSHS Answer:

There is no current information to support the development of a new cost estimate. The data from the 2005 Feasibility Study such as the Request for Information (RFI) responses and the survey of other states involved in child care system development will be shared with the e-Child Care Feasibility Study Project Management Team successful bidder.

- 4 The expectations posed for the Project Manager and Project Team included: “Assess and revise the project scope as needed”.
- (a) When referencing the Project Manager and Team assessing and revising project scope, are you referencing the feasibility study scope, the scope of the recommended alternative, or both?

- (b) In addition to the expansion of scope outlined above, what other revisions to scope are anticipated or desired?

DSHS Answer:

The Project Manager and Project Team are expected to develop a revised and expanded scope for the e-Child Care Project. This will require revising several elements of the Feasibility Study such as requirements, the recommended best alternative, the cost benefit analysis, and investment plan.

- 5 The RFP indicates that the selected consultant would be requested to “develop and manage any follow-on development of procurement documents...”
- (a) What is the intended extent of the consultant team’s involvement in this effort?
- (b) Do you see DSHS/DEL managing the effort, with the consulting team providing advice, guidance and staff augmentation, or will the consulting team lead that effort?

DSHS Answer:

The Project Team will be expected to lead and manage the effort to develop procurement documents. This includes drafting the documents and developing and carrying out a review and comment process.

- 6 The table on page 4, second column, refers to an Investment Plan - what template does the DSHS require to be used for this Investment Plan?

DSHS Answer:

Templates can be found at the ISB website:

<http://www.isb.wa.gov/tools/pmframework/planning/investment.aspx>

- 7 What does the phrase "within 30 days of contract execution" mean?

DSHS Answer:

“Within 30 days of contract execution” means 30 days from the date the contract has been signed and in place.

- 8 Could you please elaborate on the following qualification?
- ~~All key personnel being proposed must have six or more years of experience~~
managing large, complex information technology projects, or providing technical analysis services for their proposed team role or function on Level 2 or Level 3 projects (or their equivalent) as defined by the Washington State Information Services Board (ISB). The description of Level 2 and Level 3 projects can be found in the ISB Information Technology Portfolio Management Standards.

DSHS Answer:

- At a minimum the proposed Project Manager should have six or more years of experience managing large, complex information technology projects.
- At least one of the team members being proposed to fill the role of a technical lead should have experience doing so on Level 2 or Level 3 projects (or their equivalent) as defined by the

Washington State ISB.

- At least one of the team members being proposed to fill the role of a business analyst should have experience doing so on Level 2 or Level 3 projects (or their equivalent) as defined by the Washington State ISB..
- At least one of the team members being proposed to fill the role of a technical writer should have experience doing so on Level 2 or Level 3 projects (or their equivalent) as defined by the Washington State ISB.
- At least one of the team members being proposed to fill the role of a business process re-engineering analyst should have experience doing so on Level 2 or Level 3 projects (or their equivalent) as defined by the Washington State ISB.
- One person may fill multiple roles as long as they have the experience listed above for each role they are proposed for.
- More than one person may be proposed to fill a single role, one of those people must have the experience listed above for that role.

- 9 According to the original feasibility study, the preferred Child Care solution is a hybrid solution that integrates existing DSHS applications with commercially available solutions. What commercially available solutions have been considered or evaluated to date?

DSHS Answer:

There has been no consideration or evaluation of any commercially available solutions.

- 10 Could you comment on your preference for a feasibility expert that has Child Care solutions experience?

DSHS Answer:

If a vendor has experience with child care solutions it is expected that this would be indicated in the resumes submitted and the vendor's ability to meet the minimum or preferred qualifications. There is no preference for a feasibility expert that has child care solution experience.

- 11 Could you elaborate on the meaning of Solution Procurement?

DSHS Answer:

Solution Procurement is the process used by the state to purchase an Information Technology product that meets specific business requirements. More information on the IT Procurement Process can be found at the Information Services Board website:

<http://www.isb.wa.gov/tools/pmframework/index.aspx>

- 12 Has DSHS contracted or consulted with any vendor previously on this project? If yes, will this vendor be allowed to respond to this RFP as well?

DSHS Answer:

The 2005 Feasibility Study was completed with the assistance of a contracted vendor. There are no restrictions on who may respond to this RFP as long as the vendor is on the GA pre-qualified list.

- 13 Your procurement schedule states that questions from vendors closes on Oct. 26, 2006 at 5PM with answer to be provided by Nov. 3, 2006. Answers to many of the questions asked are needed in order for a vendor to make a decision on developing and responding to your RFP. The timeframe only allows 2-3 business days for a vendor to respond with their proposal after the

questions are answered. We respectfully request that some additional time be given to provide the proposal (min of 5 business days) or for a dramatically shortened timeframe on providing answers to the questions.

DSHS Answer:

The answers to all of the Q&As were posted on November 1st. Bidders have five (5) working days until proposals are due, therefore the scheduled does not need to be modified.

- 14 At what stage in the process does DSHS envision business requirements would be defined and documented?

DSHS Answer:

DSHS envisions high level business requirements would be defined in time to provide a revised cost estimate by early March. DSHS envisions detailed business requirements would be defined after the revised cost estimate is completed.

- 15 What is the preferred approach to managing business requirements?

DSHS Answer:

In Section III.F Technical Proposals of RFP #0634-244, the State is requesting vendors to provide their proposed approach to managing business requirements.

- 16 How will business requirements be communicated, managed and traced throughout the procurement lifecycle?

DSHS Answer:

In Section III.F Technical Proposals of RFP #0634-244, the State is requesting vendors to provide their proposed approach to managing business requirements.

- 17 The time between the response to these questions and the due date for RFP responses is very aggressive. Some of the answers will determine our business decision to bid. Would DSHS consider either responding much sooner, or extending the date of the response? We would respectfully request a minimum of one full business week between the question responses and the RFP response.

DSHS Answer:

The answers to all of the Q&As were posted on November 1st. Bidders have one full business week until proposals are due, therefore the scheduled does not need to be modified.

- 18 In regards to RFP# 0634-244 e-Child Care Feasibility Study Project. If a company bids on and is successful in a contract award for RFP# 06234-244, are they then excluded from bidding/contracting for any potential follow-on project to implement a solution?

DSHS Answer:

A company that bids on and is successful in a contract award for RFP #0634-244 is not excluded from bidding/contracting for any potential follow-on project to implement a solution.

- 19 Would the State consider staffing any of the Business Analyst, Technical Writer or Business Process Re-Engineering Analyst positions with two part time people, rather than one FTE, assuming close coordination between the two part time staff?

DSHS Answer:

The State will consider staffing any of the Business Analyst, Technical Writer or Business Process Re-Engineering Analyst positions with two part time people, rather than one FTE, if there is close coordination between the two part time staff.

- 20 Would the State consider any of the positions, other than the Project Manager, working 10 to 15% of the time off site, assuming that the staff would be available on site for critical project events, meetings, conferences, etc.?

DSHS Answer:

The State will consider any of the positions, other than the Project Manager, working 10 to 15% of the time off site, if the staff are available by phone and e-mail when they are off site and if the staff are available on site for critical project events, meetings conferences, etc.

- 21 Does the State anticipate having the necessary State resources available to facilitate the aggressive project schedule?

DSHS Answer:

The State anticipates having the necessary State resources available to facilitate the aggressive project schedule.

- 22 The original e-Child Care Project Feasibility Study has identified the current business processes (Section I – E (Core Business Processes) of the Study) as well as desired business functions (Section B (Functional Model) of the Study). Have these “as-is” and/or “to-be” business processes and functions been documented in workflow models (aka swim-lane diagrams) identifying detailed tasks / activities and roles and systems performing them? If these models are available, can they be shared?

DSHS Answer:

‘As is’ and/or ‘to-be’ business processes and functions have not been documented in workflow models.

- 23 The original e-Child Care Project Feasibility Study has identified the program stakeholders and described them in Section I – A (Program Organization) of the Study. Is there an organization chart that graphically depicts these stakeholders and their relationships, and if there is - can it be shared? Is there an org chart that describes the newly created Department of Early Learning (DEL)?

DSHS Answer:

There is not an organization chart that graphically depicts these stakeholders and their relationships. Information about DEL and their organizational structure can be found at the department’s web site at: <http://www.del.wa.gov/>.

- 24 Exhibit B requires a written/typed response. Is this document available as an editable PDF or MS-Word form to facilitate our response? Or are we required to submit only a written/typed response, without inserting an electronic copy of this form into our Response as section 1.2 “Bidder Information, Certificates and Assurances Form”?

DSHS Answer:

A Word version of the document is now available on the procurement web site.

- 25 If we choose to partner or sub-contract with/to another vendor in order to respond and deliver this project, would that be acceptable to the agency? If so, would the partner vendor be required to be a current GA-approved vendor to the State?

DSHS Answer:

It is acceptable to the agency if a bidder chooses to partner or sub-contract with/to another vendor in order to respond and deliver this project. The partner vendor is not required to be a current GA-approved vendor to the State as long as the prime bidder (as defined in Section II.P. Joint Proposals of RFP #0634-244) is on the GA pre-qualified vendors list.